



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,002	07/25/2003	Michael Gabriel	12510/20	3720

26646 7590 04/03/2006

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

BELIVEAU, SCOTT E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,002

Applicant(s)

GABRIEL ET AL.

Examiner

Scott Beliveau

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/12/04 + 5/10/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 10 May 2004 and 12 July 2004 have been considered by the examiner as indicated. It is noted that the "Rating System (n.d)" article and the Weinberg, J. reference noted in applicant's submission of 10 May 2004 appears to be missing pages. The "Rating System (n.d)" reference is missing Page 5 and the Weingberg, J. reference is missing Pages 2-24. As the IDS does not identify the particular pages being submitted, only the supplied portions have been considered by the examiner.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) "525" mentioned in the description (Page 11, Line 25). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: "System and method for content access control through default profiles and metadata pointers".

Claim Objections

4. Claim 8 is objected to because of the phrase "the medium" lacks proper antecedent basis. For the purpose of art evaluation, it shall be assumed that the claim is to be dependent upon claim 7. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The particular phrase "prior without" is confusing. It is unclear if the particular phrase was meant to be in the form of an alternative or if the particular term "prior" is simply a typographical error in light of Figure 2 of the specification which illustrates the step of comparing with the default profile being performed without the user entry of information. For the purpose of art evaluation, it shall be assumed that the method "compares the metadata and the filtering criterion of the default profile without requiring a

user to provide user information” as illustrated in Figure 2. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, 16-18, 24, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Paek (US Pub No. 2003/0014751 A1).

In consideration of claim 1, the Paek reference discloses a “method to control access to content via a player system” (Figure 1) that is “accessible by a plurality of users” including a parent and their children. The method comprises “providing a default profile including at least one filtering criterion . . . describing at least one of a characteristic of content permitted for all of the plurality of users” (Para. [0006]). The system subsequently “compares metadata with a selected content and the filtering criterion of the default profile, the metadata including information related to the selected content” such as the particular rating associated with the program whereupon the system “permits or denies access to the content based upon the comparison” (Figures 2-3; Para. [0026] – [0037] resulting in the display of the content appropriate for the lowest parental level or default level of content.

Claim 2 is rejected wherein the “access to the selected content is permitted if the comparison indicates that the selected content meets the filtering criterion of the default profile” (Para. [0030]).

Claim 3 is rejected wherein the “content includes at least one of audio and video data” (Para. [0021]).

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected wherein the “selected content [is] provided on a removable medium” or “DVD” (Para. [0017]).

Claim 13 is rejected wherein the method further comprises “reverting back to the filtering criterion of the default profile in connection with accessing subsequent content” (Para. [0038]).

Claim 16 is rejected wherein the “comparing step includes comparing the metadata and the filtering criterion of the default profile without requiring a user to provide user information” (Para. [0027]).

Claim 17 is rejected as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 wherein Figure 1 of Paek illustrates a “content player accessible to a plurality of users”. The player comprises a “memory device” [113] that “stores a default profile . . . including at least one filtering criterion . . . describing at least one of a characteristic of content permitted for all of the plurality of users” (Para. [0006]). The “processor” [110] is “configured to compare metadata with a selected content and the filtering criterion of the default profile. . . to permit or deny access to the content based upon the comparison” (Figures 2-3; Para. [0026] – [0037]) resulting in the display of the content appropriate for the lowest parental level or default level of content.

Claim 18 is rejected wherein the “selected content [is] provided on a removable medium” such as a DVD (Para. [0017]).

Claim 24 is rejected wherein the “processor is configured to manage the default profile and a plurality of user profiles, each of the user profiles being associated with a respective one of the users” (Para. [0028])

Claim 33 is rejected wherein the Paek reference discloses a “method to control access to content stored on a memory device” such as a DVD (Figure 1). The method comprises “selecting the content stored on the memory device, reading metadata associated with the content, comparing the metadata to at least one stored filtering criterion . . . describing a characteristic of at least one of permitted and prohibited content; and permitting or denying rendering of the content based on the comparison” (Figures 2-3; Para. [0026] – [0037]).

Claim 34 is rejected wherein the “metadata includes ratings information” that classifies the particular content of scenes within the DVD (Para. [0006]).

Claim 35 is rejected wherein the Paek reference discloses a “content player” (Figure 1). The player comprises a “memory device” [113] “storing at least one filtering criterion describing a characteristic of at least one of permitted content and prohibit content” corresponding to a particular parental control level. The player further comprises a “processor” [110] that is “configured to compare at least one stored filtering criterion with metadata associated with selected content” and to “permit or deny rendering of the selected content based on the comparison” in accordance with the selected parental control level as compared to the program content (Figures 2-3; Para. [0026] – [0037]).

9. Claims 1-5, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horiwitz et al. (US Pat No. 6,785,901).

In consideration of claim 1, the Horiwitz et al. reference discloses a “method to control access to content via a player system” (Figure 2) that is “accessible by a plurality of users” associated with the household (Col 10, Lines 46-54). The method comprises “providing a default profile including at least one filtering criterion . . . describing at least one of a characteristic of content permitted for all of the plurality of users” (Col 2, Lines 38-54; Col 10, Lines 55-62). The particular designation of what ratings/content to block also serves to designate which characteristics are allowed. The system subsequently “compares metadata with a selected content and the filtering criterion of the default profile, the metadata including information related to the selected content” such as the particular rating associated with the program whereupon the system “permits or denies access to the content based upon the comparison” (Col 11, Lines 1-63) resulting in the display of the content.

Claim 2 is rejected wherein “access to the selected content is permitted if the comparison indicates that the selected content meets the filtering criterion of the default profile”. For example, if the default profile defines only TV-Y is acceptable, then programming with the rating can be viewed without a user needing to log into the system.

Claim 3 is rejected wherein the “content includes at least one of audio and video data” (Col 5, Lines 44-64).

Claim 4 is rejected wherein the “information of the meta data includes at least one of an MPAA rating [and] a content advisory (Col 7, Lines 18-30).

Claim 5 is rejected wherein the “filtering criterion includes at least one of an identification of acceptable ratings [and] identification of acceptable content advisories” (Col 7, Lines 18-30; Col 10, Lines 58-62).

Claim 12 is rejected wherein the method further “provides a user profile associated with a particular one of the plurality of users, the user profile including at least one filtering criterion describing at least one of . . . a characteristic of content prohibited from being accessed by the particular one of the users; comparing the filtering criterion of the user profile and the metadata; and permitting access to the selected content if the content meets the filtering criterion” (Figure 6; Col 10, Line 46 – Col 11, Line 63).

Claim 14 is rejected wherein the method comprises “requiring the user to provide user information if the selected content does not meet the filtering criterion of the default profile” should the viewer desire to watch selected content which is not permitted by the default profile (Col 10, Lines 55-65).

Claim 16 is rejected wherein the “comparing step includes comparing the metadata and the filtering criterion of the default profile without requiring a user to provide user information” (Col 10, Lines 55-65).

Claim 17 is rejected in light of claim 1. Figures 1 and 2 of the Horiwitz et al. reference illustrate a “content player accessible to a plurality of users”. The player comprises a “memory device” [22] for “storing a default profile including at least one filtering criterion . . . describing at least one of a characteristic of content permitted for all of the plurality of users” (Col 2, Lines 38-54; Col 10, Lines 55-62). The particular designation of what ratings/content to block also serves to designate which characteristics are allowed. The

Art Unit: 2623

“processor” [21] is “configured to compare metadata associated with a selected content and the filtering criterion of the default profile” (Col 11, Lines 1-53) whereupon the “processor [is] configured to permit or deny access to the content based upon the comparison” (Col 11, Lines 54-63) resulting in the display of the content as appropriate.

Claim 21 is rejected wherein the “processor” [21] “controls rendering of the content on a television” [204] and is “provided in a set-top box” (Col 5, Line 44 – Col 6, Line 11).

Claim 24 is rejected wherein the “processor is configured to manage the default profile and a plurality of user profiles . . . being associated with a respective one of the users” (Figure 6).

Claim 25 is rejected wherein the “filtering criterion includes at least one of an identification of acceptable ratings [and] identification of acceptable content advisories” (Col 7, Lines 18-30; Col 10, Lines 58-62).

Claim 33 is rejected wherein the Horiwitz et al. reference discloses a “method to control access to content stored on a memory device” such as a digital recording device (Col 5, Lines 47-55). The method comprises “selecting the content stored on the memory device, reading metadata associated with the content, comparing the metadata to at least one stored filtering criterion . . . describing a characteristic of at least one of permitted and prohibited content; and permitting or denying rendering of the content based on the comparison” (Col 2, Lines 38-54; Col 10, Lines 55-62; Col 11, Lines 1-63).

Claim 34 is rejected wherein the “metadata includes ratings information” (Col 7, Lines 18-30).

Claim 35 is rejected wherein Figures 1 and 2 of the Horiwitz et al. reference illustrate a “content player”. The player comprises a “memory device” [22] “storing at least one filtering criterion describing a characteristic of at least one of permitted content and prohibit content” in association with the default profile content (Col 2, Lines 38-54; Col 10, Lines 55-62). The player further comprises a “processor” [21] that is “configured to compare at least one stored filtering criterion with metadata associated with selected content” and to “permit or deny rendering of the selected content based on the comparison” (Col 11, Lines 54-63) resulting in the display of the content as appropriate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horiwitz et al. (US Pat No. 6,785,901) in view of alSafadi et al. (US Pub No. 2003/0088420 A1).

In consideration of claims 6 and 26, the Horiwitz et al. reference is silent with respect to the “metadata being coded in XML”. In an analogous art pertaining to the field of content distribution, the alSafadi et al. reference discloses the particular distribution of EPG ratings information or “metadata being coded in XML” (Para. [0024] and [0043]). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify Horiwitz et al. such that the “metadata is coded in XML” for the purpose of providing a means that allows for different types of content from different sources to be configured in a standardized manner for efficient processing by different EPGs (alSafadi et al.: Para. [0002] – [0005]).

13. Claims 9-11, 22, 23, and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horiwitz et al. (US Pat No. 6,785,901) in view of Ozer et al. (US Pat No. 6,704,929).

In consideration of claim 9, as aforementioned, the Horiwitz et al. reference discloses the particular usage of “metadata associated with the selected content” in conjunction with ratings data derived from an electronic program guide (Figures 4 and 5; Col; 7, Line 17 – Col 8, Line 38). The reference teaches that when a user selects a particular channel that the system identifies the programming content (Col 11, Lines 54-56). The reference, however, is silent with respect to how the particularly tuned program is associated with its particularly associated metadata. In an analogous art pertaining to the field of video distribution systems, the Ozer et al. reference discloses a system and method for tracking viewing behavior of a home entertainment system. The reference teaches that viewer programming is monitored

and that information such as that associated with ratings “metadata” as derived from the EPG is captured (Col 7, Line 53 – Col 8, Line 23; Col 11, Lines 16-28). The reference further incorporates by reference in its entirety US. Patent application No. 09/376,631 (now US Pat No. 6,708,335 – however, hereafter referred to as the Ozer et al. (‘631) application) entitled “Tracking Viewing Behavior of Advertisements on a Home Entertainment System”. The incorporated Ozer et al. (‘631) application in conjunction with identifying programming and associated metadata including ratings, discloses that “metadata is associated with the selected content using a URL in connection with the selected content, and wherein the method further comprises obtaining the metadata using the URL” (Page 15, Line 1-23; Page 16, Line 22 – Page 17, Line 6; Page 17, Line 18 – Page 19, Line 10). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify Horiwitz et al. such that the “metadata is associated with the selected content using a URL in connection with the selected content, and wherein the method further comprises obtaining the metadata using the URL” as taught by Ozer et al. for the purpose of providing a means so as to accurately measure television viewing behavior (Ozer et al.: Col 2, Lines 19-34).

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected wherein the method further comprises “obtaining the metadata using the pointer” wherein the “pointer to the metadata is encoded in a Vertical Blanking Interval of a signal of the selected content” and is a “URL” (Ozer et al. (‘631): Page 15, Lines 9-12; Page 17, Line 18 – Page 19, Line 10).

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected wherein the “processor is configured to obtain a pointer” or “URL” which is “encoded in a vertical blanking interval of a signal encoded in a vertical

blanking interval of a signal of the selected content” and wherein the “processor obtains the metadata for the comparison using the pointer” (Ozer et al. (‘631): Page 15, Lines 9-12; Page 17, Line 18 – Page 19, Line 10).

Claim 27 is rejected wherein the Horiwitz et al. reference discloses a “method to control access to content via a player system” as previously set forth. In particular, the reference discloses “selecting content” whereupon the system “obtains . . . metadata” and “compares the metadata and at least one filtering criterion . . . describing a characteristic of at least one of permitted content or prohibited content”. The system subsequently, “permits or denies access to the selected content based on the comparison” (Col 2, Lines 38-54; Col 10, Lines 55-62; Col 11, Lines 1-63). The reference, however, is silent with respect to the particular usage of a “pointer” in association with the user tuning to a particular channel so as to link the selected program with the particularly received “metadata” associated with the program.

As aforementioned, in an analogous art pertaining to the field of video distribution systems, the Ozer et al. reference and its incorporated Ozer et al. (‘631) application disclose a method wherein “selected content has metadata linked thereto via a pointer” and “obtaining the metadata using the pointer” (Ozer et al. (‘631): Page 15, Lines 9-12; Page 17, Line 18 – Page 19, Line 10). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify Horiwitz et al. such that the “metadata is associated with the selected content using a URL in connection with the selected content, and wherein the method further comprises obtaining the metadata using the URL” as taught by Ozer et al. for the purpose of providing a means so as to accurately measure television viewing behavior (Ozer et al.: Col 2, Lines 19-34).

Claim 28 is rejected wherein the method comprises “extracting the pointer from the VBI” wherein the “pointer is embedded in a Vertical Blanking Interval (VBI) of a signal of the selected content” (Ozer et al. ('631): Page 15, Lines 9-12).

Claim 29 is rejected wherein the “pointer is a URL” and the “step of obtaining the metadata of the selected content includes obtaining the metadata over the Internet using the URL” (Ozer et al. ('631): Page 15, Lines 9-12; Page 17, Line 18 – Page 19, Line 10).

Claim 30 is rejected in light of the aforementioned rejection of claim 27. Figures 1 and 2 of Horiwitz et al. illustrate a “content player” such as a set-top box. The player comprises a “memory device” [22] for “storing at least one filtering criterion describing a characteristic of at least one of permitted content or prohibited content” (Col 2, Lines 38-54; Col 10, Lines 55-62). The “processor” [21] “compares the metadata to the filtering criterion” and subsequently, “permits or denies access to the selected content based on the comparison” (Col 2, Lines 38-54; Col 10, Lines 55-62; Col 11, Lines 1-63). The reference, however, is silent with respect to the particular usage of a “pointer” in association with the user tuning to a particular channel so as to link the selected program with the particularly received “metadata” associated with the program.

As aforementioned, in an analogous art pertaining to the field of video distribution systems, the Ozer et al. reference and its incorporated Ozer et al. ('631) application disclose a method wherein a “processor” is configured to obtain a pointer to metadata associated with selected content” (Ozer et al. ('631): Page 15, Lines 9-12; Page 17, Line 18 – Page 19, Line 10). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify Horiwitz et al. such that the “metadata is

associated with the selected content using a URL in connection with the selected content, and wherein the method further comprises obtaining the metadata using the URL” as taught by Ozer et al. for the purpose of providing a means so as to accurately measure television viewing behavior (Ozer et al.: Col 2, Lines 19-34).

Claim 31 is rejected wherein the “processor is configured to extract the pointer from a vertical blanking interval (VBI) of a signal of the selected content” (Ozer et al. (‘631): Page 15, Lines 9-12).

Claim 32 is rejected wherein the “pointer is a URL” and the “processor is further configured to obtain the metadata over the Internet using the URL” (Ozer et al. (‘631): Page 15, Lines 9-12; Page 17, Line 18 – Page 19, Line 10).

14. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horiwitz et al. (US Pat No. 6,785,901) in view of Kamen (US Pub No. 2003/0014750 A1).

In consideration of claim 15, the Horiwitz et al. reference discloses the particular provision of the user needing to log onto the system in order to view blocked content. The reference discloses the particular usage of individual profiles associated with individual users (ex. [602/604/606]) and the particular usage of passwords or other identification in order to access programming (Col 11, Lines 39-63). The reference, however, is unclear with respect to the “user information including a username and a password, [and] the user profile being associated with the username”. In an analogous art pertaining to the control of access to content, the Kamen reference discloses a method for controlling access to content wherein “user information includes a username and a password [and] the user profile is associated with the username” (Figure 8; Para. [0037] – [0039] and [0046]). Accordingly, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify Horiwitz et al. such that the “user information including a username and a password, the user profile being associated with the username” for the common knowledge purpose of providing an added level of security when logging on to access restricted content and additionally for the purpose of advantageously providing a method for controlling access to recorded content (Kamen: Para. [0003] – [0005]).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made.

- The Goode et al. (US Pat No. 6,163,272) reference discloses a system and method for providing access to content using default profiles.
- The deCarmo (US Pat No. 6,760,915) reference discloses a content access control system which is operable to utilize a variety of ratings information in association with blocking content when played back through a variety of devices.
- The Ozer et al. (US Pat No. 6,708,335) reference discloses a system and method for tracking viewer behavior using pointers.
- The Pendakur et al. (US Pub No. 2003/0135857) reference discloses a system and method for filtering content based upon metadata pointers.

Art Unit: 2623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 571-272-7343.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott Beliveau
Examiner
Art Unit 2623



SEB
March 29, 2006